

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona? The Chair hears none and, without objection, appoints the following conferees:

From the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. KOLBE, KNOLLENBERG, LEWIS of California, WICKER, BONILLA, VITTER, KIRK, CRENSHAW, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. ROTHMAN and Ms. KAPTUR.

From the Committee on Appropriations, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. YOUNG of Florida, REGULA, HOBSON, OBEY and VISCLOSKEY.

There was no objection.

□ 1900

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. COLE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EMANUEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SMART SECURITY AND PRESIDENT BUSH'S SECOND TERM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, George W. Bush will lead the United States, and the free world, for another 4 years. With the weight of the Presidential contest behind him, it is my sincere hope that he will take this opportunity to shun the aggressive, unyielding, and unilateral approach to world affairs that has bedeviled his first term and

ostracized the United States from our allies. Instead, Mr. Speaker, the President must lead the country in a new, stronger and safer direction, one that makes use of aggressive diplomacy and the rule of law to accomplish what needs to be done. The point has never been clearer that, in the vast majority of situations, negotiations work; and the recent developments in Iran are a perfect example. The Bush administration's approach to Iran's pursuit of nuclear weapons has consisted of little more than saber-rattling and aggressive posturing. While the U.S. has attempted unsuccessfully to flex its muscles, three European countries have banded together to achieve real results. The United Kingdom, France, and Germany announced earlier this week that they had reached a deal to prevent the development of Iran's nuclear program for the purpose of creating nuclear weapons. In exchange, the three European powers promised that Iran would not face U.N. Security Council sanctions. The promise will be upheld because France and the U.K. are both permanent members of the Security Council and can veto any sanctions against a fully compliant Iran. To be sure, it will take months, if not years, to assure that Iran does not pose a nuclear threat to the rest of the world, but the consequences of these negotiations are significant.

By engaging Iran in direct talks, instead of a political wrestling match, three European powers were able to achieve tangible results. Negotiations worked, while U.S. aggression has not.

There has to be a better way to respond to the threats America faces, a better way than the chest-thumping aggression that was adopted by the first-term Bush administration. That is why I have introduced H. Con. Res. 392, a SMART Security Platform For the 21st Century. SMART stands for sensible, multilateral, American response to terrorism. SMART security treats war as an absolute last resort. It fights terrorism with stronger intelligence and multilateral partnerships. It controls the spread of weapons of mass destruction with uncompromising diplomacy, strong regional security arrangements, and vigorous inspection regimes. SMART security defends America by relying on the very best of America, not our nuclear capabilities but our capacity for multinational leadership and our commitment to peace and freedom around the world.

Mr. Speaker, President Bush should view the example of Iran as a lesson in how to engage so-called "rogue nations" over the next 4 years. He no longer has a reelection campaign to worry about, and there is nothing to stop him from using smarter alternatives when conducting America's foreign policy.

What kind of world will the President leave when he steps off the global stage in the year 2008? A world at war for the foreseeable future, or a world at peace, guided by the smart choices of diplo-

macy and engagement? The choice is in his hands.

THE SITUATION IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, to find out how chaotic, how messed up the situation in Iraq is, all you need to do is read the front page of yesterday's Washington Post. The top headline said, "Trouble Spots Dot Iraqi Landscape." The subhead read: "Attacks erupting away from Fallujah."

The story says:

"The fighting started in Mosul 2 days after U.S. tanks entered Fallujah. Armed men appeared in a sudden tide on a main street in Iraq's third largest city, a wide avenue where so many American convoys had been ambushed that locals nicknamed it 'Death Street.'"

"At 11 a.m. Thursday, the target was an armored SUV. Witnesses said that after its Western passengers were chased into a police station, the driver was burned alive atop the vehicle as the attackers shouted, 'Jew!' The city of 1.8 million people then devolved into chaos. Thousands of police officers abandoned their precinct houses. The governor's house was set alight. Insurgents took the police chief's brother, himself a senior officer, into his front yard and shot him dead.

"By Sunday, the dawn of a 3-day festival celebrating the end of Ramadan, control over sections of the city remained in doubt. In streets emptied by fear and gunfire, insurgents battled hundreds of Iraqi National Guard reinforcements dispatched by the interim government to quell an uprising that was at once largely expected and disquieting."

This is a story about fighting in Mosul.

U.S. troops have taken control of Fallujah, but the insurgents have simply moved out to fight alongside supporters in several other Iraqi cities. At least 38 additional U.S. troops have been killed and at least 320 more wounded in this most recent fighting.

Fortune magazine, Mr. Speaker, in its November 25, 2002 edition, a couple of months before the war started, had an article entitled "Iraq—We Win—What Then?" The Fortune article said:

"A military victory could turn into a strategic defeat. A prolonged, expensive, American-led occupation could turn U.S. troops into sitting ducks for Islamic terrorists." How right this article was.

James Webb, a hero in Vietnam and President Reagan's Secretary of the Navy, wrote in The Washington Post before the war: "The issue before us is not whether the United States should end the regime of Saddam Hussein but whether we as a Nation are prepared to occupy territory in the Middle East for the next 30 to 50 years." Secretary